<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1 - 48 are pending. Claims 17-22 and 29 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 10, 23, 27, 30 and 36 have been amended. Claims 42–48 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the March 6, 2008 Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claim 41 was allowed. The applicants have added claims 42–48, each of which depend from allowed claim 41. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 42–48 are also in condition for allowance.

In the March 6, 2008 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 30 – 40 because independent claims 30 and 36 did not have proper antecedent basis. The applicants have amended claims 30 and 36 and respectfully request that the rejection of claims 30 – 40 be withdrawn.

In the March 6, 2008 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,081,595 to Moreno et al. ("the Moreno reference"). The Examiner rejected claims 10, 11, 17 and 27 – 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,353,479 to Lubawy et al. ("the Lubawy reference"). The Examiner rejected claims 30, 31 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US. Patent No. 6,104,496 to Minowa et al. ("the Minowa reference"). The Examiner rejected claims 6 – 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Moreno reference in view of U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2003/0011801 to Simpson et al. ("the Simpson reference"). The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lubawy

reference in view of the Moreno reference. The Examiner rejected claims 13 – 16 and

19 – 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Lubawy reference in

view of the Simpson reference. The Examiner rejected claims 32 – 34 under 35 U.S.C.

§ 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Minowa reference in view of the Lubawy

reference. The Examiner also rejected claims 36 – 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

being unpatentable over the Minowa reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,912,061 to

Ozaki ("the Ozaki reference"). These rejections are respectfully traversed in regard to

the presently pending claims.

Claim 1, as amended, distinguishes over the cited references. Claim 1, as

amended, recites:

> A method of configuring a multi-media printer, comprising:
> receiving a print operation from a print client device; and
> **automatically utilizing default media selection parameters for
> the print operation if an overriding default media selection parameter
> is activated, wherein the overriding default media selection
> parameter is programmable.**

The Examiner states that the Moreno reference discloses the previous version of

the highlighted limitation in Figs. 7, 10, and 14 and column 7, line 44 – col 8, line 7 and

also Figs. 1, 2 and 5B, column 5, lines 1 – 22. *(Office Action, page 3).* Specifically, the

Moreno reference discloses the setting, or programming, of default media parameters

(media size, type and color) for each of the available paper trays, but not for a print

operation, i.e., not for a specific print job in the print queue. In fact, the Moreno

reference discloses that the print job is assigned its media selection parameters directly

by the print client (or host), or by an operator's interface on a printer, when that job is

initially created or edited by a user. In the Moreno reference, these media selection

parameters are then bound to the print job and are not changed. They are not

subsequently *overridden* by the printer, i.e., the printer **automatically utilizes default**

media selection parameters for the print operation if an overriding default media

selection parameter is activated, wherein the overriding default media selection

parameter is programmable, as is recited in claim 1, as amended. Instead, in the

Moreno reference, the parameters are simply matched to the available media currently

loaded in one of the paper trays. If the specified media is not currently available, the

system then notifies its user to load the required media. At no point, is the media

selection for the specific print job <u>overridden or altered automatically</u> by the printer.

In contrast, claim 1, as amended, recites that the media selection parameters for

a specific print operation, or print job, are automatically utilized if programmable default

media selection parameters are activated. In other words, the media selection

parameters originally specified for the print job are automatically overridden, without

user interaction, at the time of override. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that

claim 1, as amended distinguishes over the Moreno reference.

The Simpson reference does not make up for the deficiency of the Moreno

reference. The Examiner utilizes the Simpson reference to disclose that the default

media selection parameters includes a set of grayscale default settings and a set of

color default settings. *(Office Action, page 10)*. However, the Simpson reference does

not disclose **automatically utilizing default media selection parameters for the print**

operation if an overriding default media selection parameter is activated, wherein

the overriding default media selection parameter is programmable, as is recited in

claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as

amended, distinguishes over the Simpson / Moreno combination.

Independent claim 23, as amended, recites limitations similar to claim 1.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 23 distinguishes over the Moreno

/ Simpson combination for reasons similar to those discussed above.

Claims 2 – 9 depend, indirectly or directly, on independent claim 1. Claims 24-

26 depend, indirectly or directly, on independent claim 23. Accordingly, applicants

respectfully submit that claims 2-9 and 24-26 distinguish over the Moreno/Simpson

combination for the same reasons as those discussed above in regard to claim 1.

Independent claim 10, as amended, distinguishes over the cited references.

Claim 10, as amended, recites:

> A method of configuring a multi-media printer, comprising:
> receiving a print operation from a print client device;
> **determining if media selection parameters, including media
> type and media size, indicated in the print operation are operational;
> and**
> **utilizing a default media selection parameter of potential media
> selection parameters for the print operation if one of the media
> selection parameters is not operational, wherein the default media
> selection parameter is programmable.**

The Examiner states that the Lubawy reference (in Fig. 3 in steps 100-104 and

the corresponding specification) discloses the highlighted limitation. *(Office Action,*

page 5). Specifically, the Lubawy reference discloses a method for determining the

print mode to use for a particular media type, wherein the media type is determined by

reading a barcode from the physical piece of media, not by decoding the print

operation. In the Lubawy reference, the media that is being printed on has already

been selected (by the user who loaded the media), and in fact, is partially loaded into

the printer. At this point, what the printer must determine in the Lubawy reference is

14

how to print on the selected media, not determining *which* media to print on. In other words, the media has already been selected by physically loading it into the printer. Thus, the media selection parameters from the print job are not consulted, i.e., there is no **determining if media selection parameters, including media type and media size, indicated in the print operation are operational.** As noted, the Lubawy reference is determining how to print on the selected media, not determining if the parameters which are supposed to select the media are operational, as is recited in claim 10. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 10, as amended, distinguishes over the Lubawy reference.

The Simpson and Moreno references do not make up for the deficiencies of the Lubawy reference. The Examiner states that the Moreno reference discloses that a single priority of use for default printing is set and applied in column 7, line 44 – col. 8, line 7). *(Office Action, page 15).* While the applicant understands the Examiner's use of the Moreno reference, the Moreno reference does not disclose either of the limitations highlighted in the recitation of claim 11 above. As noted above, the Examiner utilizes the Simpson reference to disclose that the default medial selection parameters include a set of grayscale default settings and a set of color default settings. *(Office Action, page 16).* However, the Simpson reference also does not disclose the highlighted limitations of claim 10. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 distinguishes over the Moreno / Simpson / Lubawy combination.

Claim 30, as amended, distinguishes over the cited references.

> 30. A multi-media printer, comprising:
> a decoding module to receive print job parameters and print job data for a print job, to decode the print job parameters and the print job data to create decoded print job parameters including **decoded print job**

media selection parameters and decoded print job data, and to output the decoded print job parameters including the decoded print job media selection parameters and the decoded print job data;

a configuration memory to store default configuration parameters; and

a parameter determination module to receive the decoded print job parameters including the decoded print job media selection parameters and the decoded print job data, to receive the default configuration parameters including default media selection parameters from the configuration memory, and **to determine, utilizing the decoded print job media selection parameters and the default media selection parameters, a final print job media selection parameters for the print job**.

The Examiner states that the Minowa reference discloses the limitations of claim 30. Specifically, the Minowa reference discloses the decoding of recording paper insertion wait times and setting times for a given media type. Further, the Minowa reference describes the time to wait for a given media to be loaded into a printer, based on the media specified (or selected) by the job. In other words, there is no disclosure of the decoding of media selection parameters, i.e., parameters to select a type of media. In contrast, the Minowa reference discloses decoding wait times for a given media type that is already specified in the print job. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 30, as amended, distinguishes over the Minowa reference.

The Lubawy reference does not make up for the deficiencies of the Minowa reference. As discussed above, the Lubawy reference is not directed to determining media selection parameters, instead it is directed to determining if media print mode parameters can be utilized for a selected media. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 30, as amended, distinguishes over the Lubawy / Minowa combination.

Independent claim 36 recites limitations similar to claim 30. Accordingly,

16

applicants respectfully submit that claim 36 distinguishes over the Minowa / Lubaway combination for reasons similar to those discussed above for independent claim 30.

Claims 31-35 depend on independent claim 30. Claims 37-40 depend on independent clam 36. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 31-35 and 37-40 distinguish over the Minowa / Lubaway combination for the same reasons as those discussed above in regard to independent claim 30.

Applicants believe that the claims are in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 488-7100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should the Examiner believe that such a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

Date: September 8, 2008   By:

Mark R. Kendrick
Registration No. 48,468
Attorney for Applicant(s)

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033